arXiv:1611.03425v2 [physics.ed-ph] 17 Nov 2016

Uncertainties analysis made easy using basic electricity analogy

George C. Cardoso & Gabriel L. A. de Sousa

Physics Department, FFCLRP, Universidade de Sao Paulo, Ribeirao Preto, Brazil

E-mail: gcc@usp.br

November 2016

Abstract. We propose a battery-resistor circuit to aid introductory laboratory students visualize concepts of experimental measurement uncertainty, sums of uncertainties and uncertainty of the mean value. In the model presented the uncertainty or noise can be thought of as noise in a loudspeaker, making the analogy simple to understand. The mathematics used is simple, requires no knowledge of statistics and provides correct expressions.

1. Introduction

Uncertainty analysis is probably the most disliked part of introductory laboratory among students. Students need to characterize uncertainty, understand how different uncertainties add and how repeated measurements reduce the uncertainty in the measurement. In the most common case in the instructional laboratory, the noise level or uncertainty has constant variance – is homoscedastic. Despite good books available[1], the demonstration of the formulas on experimental uncertainties and their sums are not easily explained without using mathematics that is above the scope of a laboratory course. A quick and simple method to give physical intuition on uncertainties operations would be helpful to provide insight and increase the level of comfort among students [2]. Efforts have been made to teach uncertainties in a more interesting way[3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. However, even an intuitive understanding of the mathematical formulas used are left for a future course in statistical physics [8]. This scenario prevents the development of a mental picture of the connection between the experimental measurements and uncertainty analysis and reporting [9], creating the impression that calculation of experimental uncertainties is just busywork.

In this article we propose a simple battery-resistor circuit, where we heuristically introduce the notions of mean, standard deviation, uncertainty and illustrate correlated and uncorrelated uncertainties. Analogies create narratives that stimulate interest and help forming mental models [10, 11, 12]. Using the circuit we also derive expressions for sum of uncertainties and reduction of uncertainty with the number of

measurements. The electric circuit model also enables appreciation of the concepts of homoscedasticity and heteroscedasticity, it clarifies the need for homoscedasticity (homogeneity of variance) for a simple analysis of sum of uncertainties. The background knowledge needed are the concepts of electric power and average.

Traditionally the words uncertainty and error have been used interchangeably. Throughout this text we adopt the language of the new guide for uncertainty measurement (GUM) terminology [13, 14]. Accordingly, we use the word uncertainty used for statistical uncertainty in the determination of the mean value. GUM recommends the use of the word error only for the difference between the true value (perfect ideal measurement) and the evaluated mean (measured). Therefore, the determination of experimental error, according to this definition, is usually impossible. This paper discusses experimental uncertainties in a model where the true value is known and, since it is a thought experiment, there will be no difference between experimental uncertainty and error in the results. However, let us keep in mind that what we calculate in the introductory laboratory are the statistics of experimental uncertainties.

2. Variance as the mean power of noise

Uncertainty or noise is a combined characteristic of the quantity intended to be measured, the measurement system and, in some cases, the human operator. Here we introduce circuit where noise is introduced ad-hoc in a thought experiment in order to make our arguments.



Figure 1. Circuit with battery, noise source and resistor/resistive speaker (a) and voltage values on the resistor for successive measurements, showing the i-th sample (voltage) estimate (b).

In figure 1, V is an ideal battery with added noise v, which represents the uncertainty. The noise v can be thought of as a random number with zero mean.

$\bar{V}$ is the mean value of the total e.m.f. and is equal to V, since $\bar{v} = 0$.

There is no need to make reference to Gaussian distributions here; if desired, there are several ways to qualitatively introduce the central limit theorem by a number of graphical examples [1]. The resistor R can be thought of as a constant resistance speaker

that reproduces the noise. The constant voltage of the battery does not contribute to the noise. In an actual circuit, V would just offset the average position of the speaker's sound producing membrane.

Let us analyze the power dissipated on the resistor in the circuit shown in figure 1. The quantity intended to be measured (or signal) is the mean value of the voltage on the resistor R; since this is a thought experiment we know this value is given by $\bar{V} = V$. The amplitude of the noise v_i changes from one measurement to next (or with time) according to figure 1 (b). Here, the analogy between the circuit and error analysis is that, from the point of view of the resistor R, the noise v adds uncertainty to the determination of the true mean $\bar{V}$.

Now we calculate the mean power dissipated on R, with $R = 1\ \Omega$ for simplicity. For a given measurement or instant, the i-th total power on R is given by:

$$P_i = \frac{V[i]^2}{R} = V[i]^2 = (V + v_i)^2, \tag{1}$$

where $V[i] = V + v_i$ is the total voltage on R. Using equation 1, the mean electric power dissipated over N events i is given by:

$$\langle P \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (V + v_i)^2. \tag{2}$$

Expanding the term $(V + v_i)^2$ in the equation above we get:

$$\langle P \rangle = V^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i^2 + 2V \sum_{i=1}^{N} . \frac{v_i}{N} \tag{3}$$

For large N the last term of equation 3 tends to zero, since the mean value of the noise, $\bar{v}$, is zero, as assumed. We can now distinguish two contributions to the mean power, $\langle P \rangle$. The first one is the power $\langle P_s \rangle$ due to V (the ideal battery, or the signal). The second is $\langle P_n \rangle$, due to the noise v.

$$\langle P \rangle = \langle P_s \rangle + \langle P_n \rangle \tag{4}$$

Since $v_i = V[i] - \bar{V}$, we can rewrite the term $\langle P_n \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i^2$ as:

$$\langle P_n \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (V[i] - \bar{V})^2 \equiv \sigma^2 \tag{5}$$

Equation 5 is by definition the statistical variance (σ^2) of the set of measurements, $V[i]$ of the total e.m.f. applied to R. Therefore, the variance of the voltage on R can be interpreted as the mean power of the noise. By analogy, the variance σ^2 of a set of experimental measurements, not necessarily electrical, is the mean "power" of the uncertainty around the mean value. The standard deviation σ is the root mean square, or quadratic mean value, of the noise power.

In equation 5, the quantity calculated is technically the biased sample variance, i.e., Bessel's correction $(N - 1)$ in the denominator has not been used. For N very large, as assumed, equation 5 represents the variance.

3. Sum of Uncorrelated uncertainties

Figure 2(a) shows a circuit analogous to the one shown in the previous section but now with two ideal batteries of constant voltages V_1 and V_2, with respective added random noises v_1 and v_2. $V_1 + v_1$ and $V_2 + v_2$ are independent distributions with means V_1 and V_2 and standard deviations σ_1 and σ_2.

Figure 2(b) shows independent, uncorrelated noise sources v_1 and v_2 and their independent events or measurements i, j. An analogy for correlated noise vs. uncorrelated noise is a choir vs. a cocktail party. In the choir the sounds vary with synchronicity, perhaps as led by a common conductor. In a cocktail party, on the other hand, the sounds generated by the guests are random and independent. In this analogy, it is intuitive that the overall power of the chorus is higher than the one from the cocktail party, everything else being equivalent. The two independent, uncorrelated sources of noise can be analogous to two different groups of people in a cocktail party in our metaphor.



Figure 2. (a) Two voltage sources with noise. (b) Series of independent measurements or instances of noises v_1 and v_2.

3.1. Mean power of two noise sources

Following the steps of section 2 let us calculate the total power dissipated in R, assuming again $R = 1\ \Omega$, in the circuit of figure 2 for any given measurements i and j:

$$P = \frac{V[i,j]^2}{R} = V[i,j]^2 = (V_1 + V_2 + v_{1i} + v_{2j})^2 = (V_T + v_{1i} + v_{2j})^2, \qquad (6)$$

where $V[i,j]$ is the total e.m.f. on R, and $V_T = V_1 + V_2$. The indexes i and j are different because v_1 and v_2 are independent and uncorrelated. In such case the electric powers delivered by each of v_1 and v_2 to R are independent and uncorrelated of each other, as illustrated by figure 2(b). Mathematically, we can show this by calculating

$\langle P \rangle$. Expanding the term $(V_T + v_{1i} + v_{2j})^2$ we have that the mean power dissipated on the resistor is:

$$\langle P \rangle = V_T^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (v_{1i} + v_{2j})^2 + \frac{2V_T}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (v_{1i} + v_{2j}). \tag{7}$$

The last term above tends to zero for large N, since $\bar{v_1} = 0$ and $\bar{v_2} = 0$, by construction.

Rewriting equation 7 to put in evidence the variances, we have:

$$\langle P \rangle = V_T^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_{1i}^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_{2j}^2 + 2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_{1i} \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_{2j} \right). \tag{8}$$

If v_1 and v_2 are independent, the terms in parenthesis tend to zero for large N. However, if v_1 contains a contribution from v_2 they do not average to zero, as can be readily seen in a simple example where $v_i = v_j$. In this example the last term of equation 8 would be written as $\frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_{1i} v_{2j}$ and the last term in equation 8 would remain. Correlated error propagation is treated in reference [15].

Assuming uncorrelated uncertainties, we conclude that the mean power dissipated on R is once again a sum of two terms. The first due to the constants values V_1 and V_2, and the last to the noises v_1 and v_2:

$$\langle P \rangle = V_T^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 = V_T^2 + \sigma_T^2. \tag{9}$$

where $\sigma_T^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2$ is the mean power that is due to two noise sources in the circuit, and can be interpreted as the total variance of the e.m.f. applied to R, or a equivalent variance.

Using the same notation that was used in the first section2, we write:

$$\langle P_n \rangle = \langle P_1 \rangle + \langle P_2 \rangle \tag{10}$$

$\langle P_n \rangle$ is the total variance of the noise, and $\langle P_k \rangle$ is the variance of v_k, $k = 1, 2$.

It becomes now clear that while the mean values of a measurement add up linearly, $V_T = V_1 + V_2$, the standard deviations of the distributions, by definition the square root of the variance, add up quadratically, $\sigma_T^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2$.

4. Multiple battery circuit

Figure 3 is a generalization for and e.m.f on R due to an arbitrary number sum of batteries with added noises.

With V_k as the mean value of the voltage for each battery with added noise and σ_k as the corresponding standard deviation, we have the usual formulas for sum of means and sum of uncertainties:

$$V_T = V_1 + V_2 + V_3 + ... + V_n \tag{11}$$

$$\sigma_T^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 + ... + \sigma_n^2 \tag{12}$$



Figure 3. Multiple voltage sources with respective uncertainties.

To further illustrate the use of the circuit analogy, let's calculate the standard deviation of the mean that represents the uncertainty we have in the determination of the mean value. Let us assume all batteries with the same constant signal value V and the same variance associated to this signal σ^2. This way, measuring the e.m.f. on R due to all the batteries in series decreases the uncertainty of the mean if the number of batteries is known. By this reasoning, the mean value of all n voltages and their respective mean standard deviations on R is:

$$\langle V \rangle = \frac{V_T}{n} = \frac{n\,V}{n} = V \tag{13}$$

$$\langle \sigma \rangle = \frac{\sigma_T}{n} = \frac{\sqrt{n}\,\sigma}{n} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{14}$$

Equation 14 shows why the standard deviation of a mean value decreases with the number of measurements as $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$ [8]. In practice, it means that if we want to decrease the uncertainty by a factor of ten we need to increase the number of measurements by a factor of a hundred. In order to gauge how many measurements are needed the standard deviation σ must be estimated early in the measurement process.

In all the discussions above we implicitly assumed that the noise sources are stationary or time-independent and that multiple measurements of the same quantity have the same probability distribution for the noise (homoscedasticity).

5. Conclusion

The circuit analogy helps visualizing the meaning of measurement and their uncertainties. It makes clear the need for uncorrelated sources of uncertainty and homoscedesticity in order to use the typical expressions used in the introductory

laboratory. It also clarifies the fact that the standard deviation is a property of the noise in the measurement, not of the number of points used in the measurement. The framework provided by the electrical metaphor also helps students to question what is important and relevant in an experimental measurement systems and in their data analysis.

6. References

[1] Hughes I, Hase T. Measurements and their uncertainties: a practical guide to modern error analysis. Oxford University Press; 2010.
[2] Petley BW. The fundamental physical constants and the frontier of measurement. Hilger; 1985.
[3] Siegel P. Having fun with error analysis. The Physics Teacher. 2007;45(4):232–234.
[4] Buffler A, Allie S, Lubben F. Teaching measurement and uncertainty the GUM way. The Physics Teacher. 2008;46(9):539–543.
[5] Lubben F, Buffler A, Allie S, Campbell B. Point and set reasoning in practical science measurement by entering university freshmen. Science Education. 2001;85(4):311–327.
[6] Buffler A, Allie S, Lubben F. The development of first year physics students' ideas about measurement in terms of point and set paradigms. International Journal of Science Education. 2001;23(11):1137–1156.
[7] Allie S, Buffler A, Campbell B, Lubben F, Evangelinos D, Psillos D, et al. Teaching measurement in the introductory physics laboratory. The physics teacher. 2003;41(7):394–401.
[8] Reichl L. A modern course in statistical physics. 1998. Edward Arnold, London. 1986;.
[9] Kung RL. Teaching the concepts of measurement: An example of a concept-based laboratory course. American Journal of Physics. 2005;73(8):771–777.
[10] Duit R. On the role of analogies and metaphors in learning science. Science education. 1991;75(6):649–672.
[11] Dagher ZR. Analysis of analogies used by science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching. 1995;32(3):259–270.
[12] Herrmann F, Schmid GB. Analogy between mechanics and electricity. European Journal of Physics. 1985;6(1):16.
[13] TAG I. Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement (GUM). BIPM, IEC, IFCC, ISO, IUPAC, IUPAP, OIML, . 1995;.
[14] Kacker R, Sommer KD, Kessel R. Evolution of modern approaches to express uncertainty in measurement. Metrologia. 2007;44(6):513.
[15] Taylor JR. Simple examples of correlations in error propagation. American Journal of Physics. 1985;53(7):663–667.